



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,568	07/11/2003	Frank Robert Nemirofsky	6555/53772	3762
30505	7590	06/13/2006		
			EXAMINER	
			CARLSON, JEFFREY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3622

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,568	NEMIROFSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Carlson	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The substitute specification filed 1/12/04 has been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

■ Claim 15, it is unclear what portion of the system's plural elements includes such functionality.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-8, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al (US7013286) in view of Naftzger (US5717866).**

Regarding claims 1, 4-7, Aggarwal et al teaches a system where a user may access the world wide web using a device such as a phone [9:30-32] and after completing prerequisites or user actions [9:41-43, 11:59-61, 12:25-28] the user can receive a product coupon downloaded to their coupon wallet/phone [9:36-48, 12-19]. The coupons provided by Aggarwal et al are targeted and personalized for users [7:29-31, 41-46, 53-56, 9:63-65] and are thusly taken to provide a teaching for a user account database, user identification and a targeted user characteristic. Aggarwal et al states that the system can be used to offer different promotional schemes for different products [6:1]. Aggarwal et al does not however require the user to enter a publicized promotional code. Naftzger however teaches the concepts of including codes in various product advertising (newspaper, radio, TV) and requiring a consumer to electronically enter the code in order to receive a discount for the advertised product. In this manner, differently coded advertising sources advertising the same product can reveal the relative successes of each advertising source [15:32-62]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided coded advertising for the products available for discounting on the system of Naftzger in order to encourage web visitors to identify published codes so that the promoted products in the system of Aggarwal et al can be analyzed in terms of various advertising effectiveness.

Regarding claims 2-3, the electronic coupons of Aggarwal et al are taken to provide "promotional messages."

Regarding claims 8, Official Notice is taken that DTMF input systems are notoriously well known for entering numeric data on telephones. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided such a known signaling protocol with the interactive phone users of Aggarwal et al in order to input the necessary codes as taught by Naftzger.

Regarding claims 13, 14, Aggarwal et al teaches that the coupons can be targeted according to various rules including being targeted to a user's city [7:53-54].

6. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al (US7013286) in view of Naftzger (US5717866) and Jun et al (KR2001/097065). Regarding claims 9-12, Jun et al teaches the concepts of an interactive cell phone user receiving electronic coupons via the known SMS messaging protocol. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention for the user to have sent the appropriate codes to the system using any well known protocol including SMS and for the coupons to be delivered using SMS. Further, Aggarwal et al teaches that the coupons can include various multimedia formats [8:4-6] and because MMS is a known multimedia extension to SMS messaging, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have delivered Aggarwal et al's multimedia coupon formats in such an MMS format.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al (US7013286) in view of Naftzger (US5717866) and Kepecs (US6330543). Aggarwal et al teaches that the phone user is identified using a variety of methods and in fact states that any form of identification may be used. Kepecs also

teaches an interactive phone user accessing a centralized electronic coupon system. Kepecs teaches that a user's unique ID may be bound to his own calling number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have used such a callerID approach in order to identify the user accounts in the user database of Aggarwal et al.

8. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al in view of Naftzger and Greenberg et al (WO 00/39657).

Greenberg et al teaches a cell phone that stores electronic coupons and further displays a barcode image of the coupon which can be scanned at a retailer upon redemption [fig 3D – element 76, page 16:11-14]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have enabled the display of coupon barcode images on the phone of Aggarwal et al for automating the redemption of the coupons.

9. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al (US7013286) in view of Naftzger (US5717866), Greenberg et al and Jun et al (KR2001/097065). Jun et al teaches the concepts of an interactive cell phone user receiving electronic coupons via the known SMS messaging protocol. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention for the user to have sent the appropriate codes to the system using any well known protocol including SMS and for the coupons to be delivered using SMS. Further, Aggarwal et al teaches that the coupons can include various multimedia formats [8:4-6] and because

MMS is a known multimedia extension to SMS messaging, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have delivered Aggarwal et al's multimedia coupon formats in such an MMS format.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Nemirofsky (US5594493) teaches a device that receives electronic coupons from TV signals, stores them and displays them as a barcode for scannable redemption

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 571-272-6716. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8a-5:30p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc